

39E

RECEIVED

1

22

23

## BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

2 2085 MAR -7 P 2: 15 **COMMISSIONERS** 3 JEFF HATCH-MILLER, Chairman COMP COMMISSION 4 WILLIAM A. MUNDELL MIKE GLEASON 5 MARC SPITZER 6 KRISTIN K. MAYES 7 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF 8 ARIZONA PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY FOR DOCKET NO. E-01345A-05-0816 A HEARING TO DETERMINE THE FAIR 9 VALUE OF THE UTILITY PROPERTY OF THE COMPANY FOR RATEMAKING PURPOSES. 10 **NOTICE OF ERRATA** TO FIX A JUST AND REASONABLE RATE OF 11 RETURN THEREON, TO APPROVE RATE SCHEDULES DESIGNED TO DEVELOP SUCH 12 RETURN, AND TO AMEND DECISION NO. 13 67744 14 NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that Arizona Public Service Company ("APS" or 15 "Company") is filing a revised version of the Direct Testimony of Peter M. Ewen filed on 16 January 31, 2006 in the above-referenced docket. This filing includes a correction to the 17 table on pages 5 and 6, which summarizes the sources of cost increases relating to the 18 Company's fuel expenses. The second lined item in that table should read "Natural Gas 19 and Power Prices - \$330 million." The testimony is being provided in both redlined and 20 final versions. 21 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 7th day of March, 2006.

PINNACLE WEST CAPITAL CORP.

Law Department

Thomas L. Mumaw Karilee S. Ramaley

## SNELL & WILMER L.L.P. Deborah R. Scott Attorneys for Arizona Public Service Company ORIGINAL AND 15 COPIES OF THE FOREGOING filed this 3<sup>rd</sup> day of March, 2006, with: Docket Control Arizona Corporation Commission 1200 West Washington PHOENIX, AZ 85007 **And c**opies of the foregoing mailed, faxed or transmitted electronically this 3<sup>rd</sup> day of March, 2006 to: All Parties of Record Cobb Birdie Cobb

25

26

growth that the Company is dealing with, represents the largest component of the requested rate increase, prices for coal resources also are increasing. Coal prices increased 13% between 2003 and the Test Year and are projected to increase an additional 6% in 2006. Cumulatively, higher coal prices have raised the Company's base cost of fuel by \$34 million.

Hedging: As discussed above, coal prices, natural gas prices and power prices all increased during the Test Year and are continuing to do so in 2006. Natural gas and power prices also continue to be volatile. APS's request would have been significantly higher absent the results of the Company's commodity hedging program. All of the price increases discussed above rolled together would have amounted to an increased fuel expense of approximately \$364 million — \$330 million for gas and power and \$34 million for coal. In addition to mitigating the market volatility for natural gas and purchased power through its hedging program, the Company, was able to reduce fuel expense by more than \$169 million. By the end of August 2005, the Company had hedged 85% of its 2006 gas and power requirements. The vast majority of these contracts are at prices significantly below recent market prices and, valued at November 30, 2005, will save the Company and its customers almost \$2.50/MMBTU on the effective gas price incurred in 2006.

The following table summarizes these results on the Company's fuel expenses:

Incremental Sales Growth	\$ 147 million	

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	O
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
	O
2	
	2
2	3
$\sim$	4

\$ 330 million
\$ 34 million
\$ (169) million
\$ (43) million
\$ 299 million

Attachment PME-1 quantifies the impact of these key factors on the Company's fuel cost trends. Attachment PME-2 shows graphically the differential in costs for the Company's various resources and the changes in those costs over time. One can plainly see the impact that a changing fuel mix toward natural gas and wholesale market purchases and rising prices across all fuel resources will have on the Company's costs. Attachment PME-3 provides the values of the key factors that contribute most to those costs. Attachment PME-4 shows the rising price environment that the Company and the country have faced over the last several years with respect to 2006 deliveries of natural gas at Henry Hub. Attachment PME-5 shows a similar trend for 2006 on-peak power prices at Palo Verde.

In light of the above factors, it is easy to see why the Company has requested an interim increase in the Base Fuel Recovery Amount in Docket No. E-01345A-06-0009 and this change in base fuel rates. I am proposing that the Base Fuel Recovery amount be set at 3.1904 ¢/kWh, which reflects normalized levels of power plant performance, expected 2006 fuel and purchased power prices and corresponding hedging results, and a credit for anticipated off system sales margins and the effects of adding the Sundance units to the APS system. The

25

26

growth that the Company is dealing with, represents the largest component of the requested rate increase, prices for coal resources also are increasing. Coal prices increased 13% between 2003 and the Test Year and are projected to increase an additional 6% in 2006. Cumulatively, higher coal prices have raised the Company's base cost of fuel by \$34 million.

Hedging: As discussed above, coal prices, natural gas prices and power prices all increased during the Test Year and are continuing to do so in 2006. Natural gas and power prices also continue to be volatile. APS's request would have been significantly higher absent the results of the Company's commodity hedging program. All of the price increases discussed above rolled together would have amounted to an increased fuel expense of approximately \$364 million — \$330 million for gas and power and \$34 million for coal. In addition to mitigating the market volatility for natural gas and purchased power through its hedging program, the Company, was able to reduce fuel expense by more than \$169 million. By the end of August 2005, the Company had hedged 85% of its 2006 gas and power requirements. The vast majority of these contracts are at prices significantly below recent market prices and, valued at November 30, 2005, will save the Company and its customers almost \$2.50/MMBTU on the effective gas price incurred in 2006.

The following table summarizes these results on the Company's fuel expenses:

Incremental Sales Growth	\$ 147 million

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

Natural Gas and Power Prices	\$ <u>3</u> 30 million
Coal Prices	\$ 34 million
Hedge Value	\$ (169) million
All Other Items	\$ (43) million
Total of All Changes	\$ 299 million

Attachment PME-1 quantifies the impact of these key factors on the Company's fuel cost trends. Attachment PME-2 shows graphically the differential in costs for the Company's various resources and the changes in those costs over time. One can plainly see the impact that a changing fuel mix toward natural gas and wholesale market purchases and rising prices across all fuel resources will have on the Company's costs. Attachment PME-3 provides the values of the key factors that contribute most to those costs. Attachment PME-4 shows the rising price environment that the Company and the country have faced over the last several years with respect to 2006 deliveries of natural gas at Henry Hub. Attachment PME-5 shows a similar trend for 2006 on-peak power prices at Palo Verde.

In light of the above factors, it is easy to see why the Company has requested an interim increase in the Base Fuel Recovery Amount in Docket No. E-01345A-06-0009 and this change in base fuel rates. I am proposing that the Base Fuel Recovery amount be set at 3.1904 ¢/kWh, which reflects normalized levels of power plant performance, expected 2006 fuel and purchased power prices and corresponding hedging results, and a credit for anticipated off system sales margins and the effects of adding the Sundance units to the APS system. The